# THE 1987/88 QUOTA REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT TO THE PRODUCER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 1987/88 Quota Review Committee recommends that the Canadian Wheat Board move towards a delivery system based on grain available for sale to the Canadian Wheat Board. Producers would sign Supply Agreements with the Canadian Wheat Board stating the grain that the producer is prepared to deliver to the Canadian Wheat Board. All deliveries (and any inventories which must be held) will be based on the supplies that farmers state are available for deliveries. The system will be enforced by penalyzing those producers who fail to deliver the stated volume.

There are two major reasons for moving towards the new system. First, the Canadian Wheat Board would have more information of stocks available for sale. Although the sales program has been relatively well served by the current quota system amended to allow contracting and overdelivery privileges, the Committee felt that the system may not be the most appropriate response for the future. The space available in primary elevators has dropped by almost 30 percent in the last fifteen years and the trend is likely to continue. Further, grain marketings through the transportation and handling system continue to increase. The Committee felt that a successful marketing program could be enhanced by having enforceable supply agreements directly with producers in order to be able to call supplies readily and have good market information.

Second, the quota system has always been subject to criticism for not addressing productivity. The system has been amended to include bonus acres and to allow acreage adjustments. The Committee felt that an inventory based delivery system would provide a uniform and fair address to different levels of production.

Western Canadian agriculture has become progressively more diverse since the turn of the century. As agriculture becomes more diverse, it becomes more difficult to make a single set of regulations suit all interested groups. The Committee has endeavored to consider as many groups as possible. As the proposal advances, additional fine tuning will inevitably be required. The report should be considered a direction and a framework rather than a specific set of regulations.

...

# THE 1987/88 QUOTA REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT TO THE PRODUCER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## A. BACKGROUND

Almost a half century has passed since the Canadian Wheat Board introduced the first delivery quota in the 1939/40 crop year. The first quota limited Canadian Wheat Board purchases from each farmer to 5000 bushels (136 Tonnes). The purpose of the quota was to hold grain from the market. The government had established an initial price above market levels and wanted to limit the potential benefit to each farmer. The following year, 1940/41, the first quota acreage base was implemented. Mr. J. A. MacKinnon, Chairman of the Cabinet Wheat Commission, stated the purpose of the quota policy in a report to council, "Since there is only limited space available in elevators for new deliveries, it is very necessary that the privilege of making these deliveries should be distributed somewhat proportionately among western producers".

Agriculture on the western Canadian prairies has changed a great deal since the first quota policies were implemented. Wheat and wheat flour made up almost 90% of the grain and grain products exported from western Canada in 1939/40. Oats and barley were grown mainly for domestic consumption. Canola was unknown, and rapeseed, its predecessor, received prominence only for a few years in the second world war as a special lubricating oil. Special crops such as lentils, beans, peas, corn and sunflowers were more likely to be found in the garden section than in the field crop section at the local fair. There were approximately 235,000 farms spread across the western Canadian prairies when the first quota system was implemented.

Although some differences existed between farms and between regions at the time of the first quota system, the degree of diversity was much less than today. The number of varieties and types of wheat has increased manyfold. Canola has switched from a specialty crop to one of the major export crops in western Canada. Lentils, peas, beans, corn, potatoes, sunflowers, and many other special crops have made their way from the garden to the field. Concurrent with the increase in diversity of crops has been a great increase in the range of farm size. Many farms in western Canada have remained as one quarter on one half section units, while many others have grown to multiple section units. Total deliveries to the Canadian Wheat Board provides one indication of the variability in farm size. In 1986/87, 20% of the largest producers delivered 52% of the grain received by the Canadian Wheat Board; 20% of the smallest producers delivered 3% of the grain (see Table 1). In total, the number of permit holders has declined to approximately 143,000.

TABLE 1

Summary of Deliveries to the Canadian Wheat Board in 1986/87

| Percentage of Producers | Percentage of Deliveries |
|---|---|
| 20 | 52 |
| 40 | 76 |
| 60 | 90 |
| 80 | 97 |
| 100 | 100 |

The demands placed on the western Canadian marketing system have changed dramatically over the past 50 years. There were approximately 5,650 elevators which were available for farm deliveries in the 1939/40 crop year. These elevators had a total storage capacity of 190 million bushels (5.2 MMT).

Grain was delivered to country elevators in loads of 100 bushels or less. In 1986/87, grain was delivered to 1,860 country elevators which had a total storage capacity of 7.74 MMT. Grain exports moved through the system changed from 5.9 MMT in 1939/40 to 30.5 MMT in 1986/87. The volume of export grain has been increased by more than five fold through an elevator system which is only 1.5 times the capacity of the 1939/40 system.

As agriculture and marketing structures available to serve agriculture changed, the quota system has also evolved to serve the industry. The most dramatic change which took place in the focus of quota system occured in the 1970/71 quota review (Boden Report). In that review, it was recognized that quotas could be used to pull the right kinds, and quality of grain to the correct position at the correct time. Quotas were set by grain and grade in order to meet market requirements. The next major review of the quota system was in 1978/79 (Lea Report). The primary outcome of this review was to establish quotas on the movement of off-board and non-board grains. The change was implemented to ensure a more efficient use of available space and to provide some equity between board and non-board crops. Other changes which evolved from the 1978/79 review were an increase in the over-delivery privilege for seed and an increased ability of producers to reassign quota acres. Since the 1978/79 review there have been numerous changes to the quota system. In 1980/81 and again in 1983/84, regulations on the reassignment of quota acres as they pertained to selected grains were changed. In 1986/87, the acreage assignment to non-board crops was restricted to the area seeded to these crops. This decision was later reversed. In addition, two new

programs, contracting and bonus acres were introduced. Each of these programs caused shifts of delivery opportunity between farmers and between regions. The bonus acre provision introduced in 1982/83 was an attempt to address productivity differences. The contracting program was put in place to allow the Canadian Wheat Board to draw feed grain supplies while markets were available.

The above summary is not a complete list of the many changes in agriculture, the delivery system, or the quota system over the past half century. The above discussion merely points out the reason for the current review of the quota system. First, agriculture is becoming more diverse and it is extremely important that a changing industry continue to examine and re-examine the rules which guide the marketing process. Second, the forwarding or drawing function of quotas has allowed the board to draw increased volumes through a primary elevator system which has ever-decreasing storage space. Are there more changes which should be made to allow the Canadian Wheat Board to draw the grain that is needed in a timely, equitable, and efficient manner? Third, many changes have been made over recent years as the Canadian Wheat Board approached new marketing tasks. It is important to ensure that each of these changes are consistent with each other, are as simple as possible, and are fulfilling the requirements of equity and efficiency which are expected of a delivery system.

## B. PROCEDURE

In June, 1987, the Producer Advisory Committee to the Canadian Wheat Board struck a Committee to review the Canadian Wheat Board quota system. The Committee consists of three members of the Producer Advisory Committee and two Canadian Wheat Board staff representatives. The Terms of Reference which were drafted by the Quota Review Committee and accepted by the Producer Advisory Committee are as follows:

### Terms of Reference

### General Comment:

> The Canadian Wheat Board strives to market all grain which farmers wish to deliver to the Board in any given year. In years when marketing all grain is feasible within the given year, the quota system attempts to draw the required grain from farmers as it is needed. In years when marketing all grain is not possible, the quota system divides delivery opportunities among producers.

The primary objectives of the delivery quota system for Western Canadian grains is twofold:

(a) to bring into market channels, within the authority of the Canadian Wheat Board Act, at the right time, the kinds, qualitities, and quantities of all grain required to effectively meet market demand:

(b) to allocate delivery opportunities for grain in demand, to producers, with a reasonable degree of equity.

Secondary objectives which are desirable if consistent with the primary objectives stated above include:

(a) promoting an orderly grain flow for efficiency in the operation of handling and transporation facilities;

(b) providing producers the freedom to deliver to elevators of their choice;

(c) developing a quota system with the greatest degree of simplicity which is adaptable to increasing use of computer facilities. The system must be enforceable.

In an attempt to achieve the stated objectives, the Quota Review Committee is instructed to review the current quota policies of the Canadian Wheat Board and any alternative methods available for drawing grain into the grain handling system.

---

The Quota Review Committee's first priority was to solicit input from farmers, farm organizations, government agencies and grain companies. An invitation for views and concerns was sent to over 70 farm organizations, grain companies, and government agencies. In addition, a press release was issued to publicize the terms of reference of the Committee and invite submissions. "Grain Matters" also published the Terms of Reference. The deadline for submissions was December 31, 1987.

...

In order to complete the review in a reasonably shorter time period, and to ensure everyone equal access to the review, only written submissions were accepted.

The Committee received 117 submissions from the following sources:

| | |
|---|---|
| Individual farmers | 58 |
| Farmer Organizations | 25 |
| Grain Handling Companies | 10 |
| Processors | 3 |
| Government Organizations | 11 |
| Miscellaneous | 10 |
| Total | 117 |

Each submission was copied to all Committee members and then each was discussed by the entire Committee. All statements and concerns were noted. The strength of each argument was analyzed on its merit. The Committee would like to thank all those who took the time to make a submission. The submissions were extremely helpful in examining the strengths and weaknesses of the current system as well as providing a number of viable alternatives.

In addition to the many written submissions which were received, the Committee met with G. P. Machej, Executive Director, Marketing; Mike Martin, Director, Transportation Western; and F. G. VanAlstyne and Doug Milhausen, General Director and Director of the Country Services Division. The purpose of these sessions was to review the present system from an administrative perspective.

## C. MAJOR ISSUES

From the many hours of Committee meetings a number of central issues continued to re-emerge. A short list of the major issues includes:

1. Equity. The terms of reference clearly give the Committee a mandate to "allocate delivery opportunities for grain in demand, to producers, with a reasonable degree of equity". The concept of equity implies a measure of justice or fairness as opposed to equal which implies "sameness". Equity or "just distribution of markets" can take on almost as many meanings as there are producers in western Canada. Some definitions of equity which have surfaced in the discussions and submissions include:

1. equal delivery opportunity per cultivated acre;
2. equal delivery opportunity per seeded acre;
3. equal delivery opportunity per acre seeded to a particular crop;
4. equal delivery opportunity per bushel grown;
5. equal delivery opportunity per bushel available for sale to the Canadian Wheat Board;
6. equal delivery opportunity per farm;
7. delivery opportunity denominated in dollars rather than bushels.

This list in no way includes all potential definitions. The previous quota system used primarily the first definition but included aspects of 2 and 3

(bonus acre calculation) and 6 (the allocation of malt barley cars). Proponents of change have argued that this system is not equitable as some farmers hold a disproportionate share of total inventory. Others took the position that the current system was fair and that change would only further advantage those who had good yields.

The Committee has embarked on a new path in defining equity. Equity will be defined under the proposed system as an equal percentage of the total market for the grade and grain each producer makes available for sale to the Canadian Wheat Board. There will be a provision built in to expand this definition of equity to recognize individual farm units by providing a minimum delivery opportunity early in the crop year. The Committee felt that this approach to equity was simpler and could replace the complex bonus acre and acreage reassignment processes.

...

While the Committee recognizes the extreme importance of equity of delivery opportunity, the Canadian Wheat Board must continue to order grain as required by customers. For this reason, different delivery calls on different grades and types of grain will have to open at different times.

2. Productivity. Equity and productivity, although different issues, involve many of the same questions of fairness. Proponents of change argue that the current system of basing deliveries on an adjusted acreage base is not equitable. It is argued that area is only one of the inputs to production and

that not all acres are equal; nor should they be treated as equal. The foundation of this argument is that agronomic practices lead farmers in different regions to seed a different percentage of their land. In addition, the ten year average wheat yield (1977 - 86) varies from a low of 21.4 bu/acre in crop district 4A in south west Saskatchewan to a high of 39.5 bu/acre in crop district 5 in central Alberta. Within these regions, yields vary dramatically between farms and between years.

Two policies have been in place to handle productivity in the present system . First, acreage reassignment and delivery against acres sown to "non-quota" crops have shifted some delivery opportunity to higher yield, intensive farming regions. Second, bonus acres have allowed farmers summerfallowing less than one-third of the acreage seeded to one of the six major grains to claim additional delivery opportunity. The net result of these policies in balancing productivity varies between regions and between years.

The Committee felt that the current system's address to productivity was complicated and biased toward particular crops. The current policy allows farmers to transfer acres from specialty crops, barley, and non-board grains as the delivery opportunity exceeds the expected yield. The result is that the system has a delivery bias towards all crops except wheat. In years when inventory is held on farm due to a shortage of wheat markets, the bias against wheat reflects world markets. However, if a shortage of transportation is causing inventories to be held, the bias against wheat is probably undesirable.

The Committee felt that a simpler method of addressing productivity would be to base deliveries on the volume of grain each producer agrees to make available for sale to the Canadian Wheat Board. The base would thus consider all factors of production. Further, no bias would exist betweeen crops as long as non-board grains did not have disproportionate access to the transportation system.

3. Ability of Canadian Wheat Board to Draw Grain. The ability of the Canadian Wheat Board to draw grain in a timely manner to meet sales is becoming increasingly important. The available primary elevator space has decreased from 11.0 MMT in 1971/72 to 7.7 MMT in 1986/87 - a drop of almost 30% in 15 years. The storage capacity in primary elevators is expected to continue to decline. The sales program has not been seriously inhibited by this decrease in space to this point. However, the Committee felt that in order to maintain, or increase the export program, the Canadian Wheat Board will need better information about the grain that farmers wish to deliver to the Board. A broad range of submissions expressed a basic acceptance of the Board's need for information of the grain that it must sell.

The Committee therefore recommends that all farmers declare to the Canadian Wheat Board the volume of wheat, barley and oats that is held on farm immediately following harvest. Grade information could also be estimated by farmers and provided to the Canadian Wheat Board.

4. Domestic Feedgrains Market. Since the move to the present marketing structure in the Western Canadian feedgrains market, barley and oats producers have had the option of selling into either a pooled or a spot market. Producers who wished to exercise the option often preferred to withhold deliveries from the Canadian Wheat Board until late in the crop year. By doing this, producers were able to capture any premiums which materialized in the off-board market. If no substantial premium existed, there was an expectation that the grain could be delivered for sale on the export market through Canadian Wheat Board pool account. The result was that the Canadian Wheat Board could not always draw grains at the time that markets were available. Further, the Canadian Wheat Board was expected to find markets at year-end after supplies became known. The situation in certain years was unworkable. In response, the Canadian Wheat Board introduced the Guaranteed Delivery Contract for barley on an experimental basis in the 1985/86 crop year. The contract provided the Canadian Wheat Board with a guaranteed supply at the time the grain was required. The producer received a guarantee that the barley could be delivered within the given crop year. The result was an enhanced ability to capture international markets for western Canadian farmers. To the extent that feedlot operators are able to offer similar private delivery contracts, the domestic market also continues to be serviced during the two years of the barley contracting program. One potential problem which could exist under a Canadian Wheat Board barley contracting program would be for the Canadian Wheat Board to have enough grain under contract in a local area that livestock feeders were required to haul feedgrains in from another region.

Looking to the future, the Committee felt that the Canadian Wheat Board must continue to receive accurate statements in advance of the grain that producers are willing to commit to the Board. The variability of supplies will likely increase when U.S. feedgrains can enter Canadian markets under the Canada/U.S. Free Trade Agreement. The Committee felt that a return to the system of drawing grain which relied only on quotas would not be workable. The potential concerns of the western Canadian livestock industry must be addressed.

5. Enforcement. Many submissions received by the Committee advocated that the Canadian Wheat Board increase the enforcement of delivery regulations. The submissions pointed out that producers who violate delivery deadlines and make inaccurate declarations infringe on both the efficiency and the equity of the delivery system. The small minority who do not respect the delivery regulations cause a cost to the system which must be borne by the large majority of producers. Although the Committee recognizes that enforcement of rules always involves some discretion, the Committee recommends that the proposed system be rigorously enforced in order to ensure that some individuals do not gain an advantage by false declarations. Delivery terminations must also be enforced. Enforcement methods are suggested later in this report.

6. Environmental Concerns. A number of environmental groups expressed concern that the current quota system promoted cultivation of marginal lands and promoted increased summerfallowing. The environmental groups argued that bonus acres be provided for maintaining marginal lands and developing wildlife habitat. The Committee felt that the primary reason for breaking marginal lands was the economic pressures placed on farmers. However, the committee recognizes the importance of soil conservation and the benefit of wildlife habitats. The recommendation that the delivery system of the future be based on inventory rather than acres should remove the perception among some groups that the Canadian Wheat Board is a major factor causing increased summerfallow and the breaking of marginal lands.

7. Other Issues. A large number of other issues were raised in the submissions and received active consideration by the committee. A number of these issues were considered to be beyond the scope of the review.

## D. MAJOR RECOMMENDATION

The Quota Review Committee recommends that the Canadian Wheat Board begin to draw grain on the basis of grain committed by producers to the Board.

1. Documentation

(a) Application for Permit. Producers will submit an application for permit as under the present system. The application will include all information provided under the current system except quota acres.

(b) Inventory Declarations. The producer will declare to the Canadian Wheat Board all supplies of wheat, oats and barley held on farm following harvest. An estimate of the grades of wheat will be listed on the declaration. The inventory declaration will be made following harvest but prior to October 31.

(c) Supply Agreements. Supply Agreements will be commitments to deliver a stated volume of wheat, barley or oats to the Canadian Wheat Board as these grains are required by the Board. For wheat, each type of grain will be listed separately. The Supply Agreement would not be grade specific however the producer would provide an estimate of the grade breakdown of the stated supplies. All delivery opportunity will be defined as a portion of the Supply Agreements.

The Major Supply Agreement must be signed prior to October 31st if producers wish to deliver grain to the Canadian Wheat Board in the period from August 1st to February 28th. The Major Supply Agreement may be adjusted upwards, once during the period from August 1 to October 31. The Supply Agreement should include all grain that the producer is willing to commit to the Canadian Wheat Board.

In order to provide flexibility for producers who are unable to determine the total grain they have available for sale to the Canadian Wheat Board, two subsequent Supply Agreements are available. These Supply Agreements must be signed before February 28th and May 31st.

2. Delivery Calls

(a) Minimum Call. Each producer will be allowed to deliver a minimum of 25 tonnes of grain. The grain delivered under a minimum call must be grain required by the Canadian Wheat Board. The purpose of the minimum call is to allow a number of producers who have very small volumes to deliver their entire crop so the deliveries will not have to be spread over extremely small amounts throughout the crop year. The call will allow the Canadian Wheat Board to call some grain prior to farmers signing Supply Agreements. The first deliveries in a year will be charged against the minimum delivery call. The 25 tonne figure was developed to reflect current conditions and may have to be adjusted through time.

(b) Remaining Calls. Calls will be issued as a percentage of grain held under Supply Agreement. All Supply Agreements signed during the period from August 1st to October 31st are eligible for delivery at the time the agreement is signed. Supply Agreements signed after October 31st will be eligible for the calls which are not terminated before the final day of the period. Calls will be made on a grade or location specific basis as required but there will be a general attempt to keep calls as close to equal as possible.

## 3. Special Situations

(a) Selected Grains. Producers wishing to submit a sample for selection have two options. The producer may opt to place the grain under a Supply Agreement. If the producer does this, the grain registered on the Supply Agreement must be delivered to the Canadian Wheat Board if the sample is not accepted. In return for making the initial commitment to the Canadian Wheat Board, the producer is eligible for all past calls at the time the grain is rejected. If a carload of grain under a Supply Agreement is rejected at unload, the producer is eligible for past calls with the remainder of the grain accepted against future calls.

The producer may opt not to place the grain submitted for selection under the Supply Agreement. If the producer does this, the producer retains the option of selling the grain to the off-board market if the grain is not accepted. The only way that the producer would then deliver the grain to the Canadian Wheat Board would be to sign a Supply Agreement in a later period and receive those calls which are still open for that supply agreement. The producer has traded the access to past delivery calls for the option of selling the rejected grain to the off-board market.

(b) Feed Grain User. The Committee recommends that the Canadian Wheat Board make grain held under Canadian Wheat Board Supply Agreements available for sale to the local feeding industry. The feeders could contact the Canadian Wheat Board prior to needing delivery of the grain. The Canadian Wheat Board

could then notify local feed producers that their contract was purchased. The producer could have the grain weighed at a local elevator and have a cash ticket issued. The elevator company could receive a fee for weighing the grain and issuing the ticket. The producer could receive the initial price for the grain and could be eligible for any final payments. The feeder could be required to pay a market related price and be responsible for transportation beyond the primary elevator. The current policy of allowing off-board switching of feed grain stocks could remain in effect.

(c) The present policies of over-delivery for seed and gristing will not be changed.

4. Enforcement

The majority of submissions indicated a desire for increased enforcement and the Committee concurs that enforcement of regulations is an essential cornerstone of any delivery system. In addition, a large number of submissions suggested spot-checking a random sample of producers. The Committee concurs with the submissions and recommends that the Canadian Wheat Board spot-check a random sample of producers in order to ensure that Applications for Permit, Inventory Declarations, and Supply Agreements are accurate.

The Committee recommends that any producer who does not deliver up to an acceptable tolerance (suggests 10%) of the volume stated on the Supply Agreement, be responsible for paying a penalty to the Canadian Wheat Board.

These penalties could be defined as a set dollar value per tonne. The purpose of the fine is to ensure that producers do not overstate Supply Agreements in order to gain disproportionate access to the system. The Committee recognizes the responsibility of producers to meet terminations on delivery calls. The Canadian Wheat Board will notify producers who miss delivery calls. If no satisfactory response is received and if missing the call means that the producer is unable to meet the terms of the Supply Agreement, the producer would be liable for the fine. During implementation, the Committee recommends that all first offences could be waived in favor of a warning. All subsequent offences would be charged.

5. Quotas on off-board and non-board grains

Many submissions argued that quotas should be removed on non-board grains. The quotas are perceived as an undue restriction on the movement of these products. The Canadian Wheat Board is perceived as only being responsible for wheat, barley and oats. The delivery restrictions are perceived to affect the margins in the markets for these crops. However, non-board grains have had preferential treatment at West Coast ports and in total movement. From 1977/78 to 1986/87 non-board grains spent, on average, 10 days longer in western ports than did Board grains. In addition, canola average stocks to production ratio was maintained at a lower level than any of the Board grains indicating a disproportionate access to rail cars. In addition, the canola exports have been allowed to move almost exclusively through premium West Coast ports.

With the move to a new system, it may be possible for the Canadian Wheat Board to remove quotas on off-board and non-board grain. However, if this is to take place, Board grains must be ensured their fair share of elevator space, total movement, West Coast movement, and storage space at port. Until this access can be provided through some other agencies, the Committee recommends that the delivery restrictions are maintained on off-board and non-board grains. When the Canadian Wheat Board begins to draw Board grains on the basis of Supply Agreements, any quotas which are necessary on non-boards may be provided on a seeded acreage base and a carryover statement.

6. Information

A large number of submissions asked for increased information. The committee recommends that the Canadian Wheat Board examine buying time on major radio stations to announce delivery calls and termination dates. Special programs could also be explained.

## E. POTENTIAL EFFECT ON PRODUCTION

Any delivery regulations have a potential effect on production. The Committee recognized that the impact on production patterns was a potential problem. However, the Committee was unable to estimate the size of the potential production shifts. The terms of reference of the Committee indicated that the quota policy of the future should be determined on the basis of the marketing objectives which it outlined. The Committee felt that the marketing

objectives of equity and efficiency were addressed more appropriately under the proposed policy. The effect on production should be studied further and should be monitored as the program is put in place.

## F. CONCLUSION

In an industry as diverse as Western Canadian agriculture, it is extremely difficult to devise a system which suits all farmers. The Committee has endeavored to treat all farmers fairly. Equity has been defined as having proportional access to the markets and includes a minimum delivery call.

Since 1970/71, the Canadian Wheat Board quota regulations have increasingly been used as a marketing tool to bring forward the desired types and grades of grain at the required time. Over the past 15 years, the result of this effort is realized. In 1986/87, the Canadian Wheat Board exported 26.6 MMT of grain. These exports were moved through a primary elevator system which has 30% less storage capacity than the system had in 1970/71.

As Western Canadian agriculture moves from the 1980's to the 1990's continuing evolution of the marketing system is expected. The volume of storage available at primary elevators is likely to continue to decline. Technological change will allow information to be transmitted much more quickly. International trading agreements may change the face of the grain

trade. However, specific buyer demands and intense competition are likely to continue in a world market that is always difficult to forecast. To best serve farmers the Canadian Wheat Board must have a marketing structure which is prepared for the future rather than being forced to react to upcoming changes.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED THIS 12TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1988.

A. K. Sahl, Chairperson

Larry N. Maguire

Micheal G. W. Halyk

P. A. Wallace

Ian McCreary

2398M